1 2	Michael W. Armstrong (SBN 87799) NOLAN, ARMSTRONG & BARTON, LLP 600 University Avenue		
3	Palo Alto, CA 94301 Tel. (650) 326-2980 Fax (650) 326-9704		
4	Counsel for Defendant		
5	Keven Yang		
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10			
11			
12	UNITED STATES,	Case No. CR 11-00472 RMW	
13	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO CONTINUE STATUS	
14	v.	HEARING DATE	
15		Date: December 10, 2012	
16	KEVEN CHEN CHIEH YANG,	Time: 9:00 a.m.	
17	Defendant.	Court: The Hon. Ronald M. Whyte	
18			
19			
20	Defendant, Keven Yang, through his counsel, Michael W. Armstrong, of Nolan,		
21	Armstrong & Barton, LLP, hereby moves the court for a continuance of the status hearing		
22	presently scheduled for Monday, December 10, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. before the Honorable Ronald		
23	M. Whyte.		
24	The reason for this motion is that on approximately October 17, 2012, Judge Grewal		
25	approved the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum to the law firm of Fenwick & West. The records		
26	sought by defendant include documents and communications between Fenwick & West and their		
27	then-client, Mr. Calvin Yu, and his father who are the alleged victims of the crimes charged		
28	against Mr. Yang in the present indictment. Fenwick & West advised Mr. Yu and his father about		
40			

MOTION TO CONTINUE STATUS HEARING AND [PROPOSED] ORDER; CASE NO. CR 11-00472 RMW 1

3

10

7

11 12 13

15

16

14

17 18

20 21

19

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

entering into various business dealings with Mr. Yang in approximately 2006 through 2008, some of which dealings are the subject of the present indictment.

In the discovery already received from the government in this case are included emails from Fenwick & West to Mr. Yu, some of which are then forwarded on to Mr. Yang. The communications among these parties and the advice and knowledge passed on to Mr. Yu from his then-attorneys at Fenwick & West are important facts for the determination of issues raised by this indictment.

The subpoena duces tecum was served on Fenwick & West on November 1, 2012, and since that date, defendant's counsel, Michael W. Armstrong, has been in contact with lawyers at Fenwick & West about the production of these documents. Fenwick & West has indicated that they have issues with both the scope of the subpoena in terms of the records sought, as well as possible privilege issues, since they were not representing Mr. Yu in the subsequent civil suit brought by him against Mr. Yang which was litigated in the California State Court. The issues raised by Fenwick & West, both as to the scope of the subpoena and the privilege issues, are complex and need more time to be sorted out between counsel for Mr. Yang and Fenwick & West.

I have advised counsel for the government, Amber Rosen, of the situation, and even forwarded on to her a written reply that I received from Fenwick & West as to their concerns about the subpoena. Ms. Rosen has indicated to Mr. Armstrong that she has no objection to this request for a continuance of the status hearing, but wanted Mr. Armstrong to put this information in writing before the court in the form of a motion so that the court and counsel would have further written understanding of the issues raised by the issuance of the subpoena duces tecum in this case.

///

///

///

///

///

1	For these reasons, counsel for defendant moves the court for a continuance of the status		
2	hearing from December 10, 2012 to Hgdtwct ("6, 2013.		
3	8 R	espectfully submitted,	
4	4 N	OLAN, ARMSTRONG & BARTON	
5	5		
6			
7		/s/ IICHAEL W. ARMSTRONG	
8	A	ttorney for Defendant KEVIN YANG	
9			
10			
11	Dated: December 7, 2012	/s/ MBER ROSEN	
12		ssistant Unites States Attorney	
13	3		
14	1		
15			
16	ORDER		
17	For the foregoing reasons, the Court grants the motion to continue status hearing and		
18	continues the next status conference in this case from December 10, 2012 to Hgdtwct { '6. '4013 at		
19	9:00 a.m. For the reasons stated above, the Court further finds that the ends of justice served by		
20	granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a		
21	speedy trial. See U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(7)(iv). Accordingly, time shall be		
22	excluded from December 10, 2012 through Hgdtwct ('6, 2013.		
23	SO ORDERED.	2	
24	ı	mald M. Whyte	
25	Dated: December $\frac{\ddot{l}}{l}$, 2012 $\frac{l}{l}$	NORABLE RONALD M. WHYTE	
26	5		
27	7		
28			